

SR Feedback from JRA1

D.Cesini (INFN/IGI)

- JRA1 is very interested in the staged rollout
 - as an extension of the internal test phase
 - Limited manpower
 - Difficulties in having independent testing
 - To be applied only to regionalised tools
- Written procedure (MS402) seems reasonable to us, but...
- ...probably we tried it too early...

- Tried the SR with 3 NAGIOS Updates
- Step1: the software provider creates a new ticket in the “**staged-rollout**” RT queue in the state “Certified”:
 - <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=155> (NASIOS-Update2)
 - <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=252> (NASIOS-Update3)
 - <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=293> (NASIOS-Update4)
- We received no central coordination in the tickets
- We tried to coordinate on our own with the EA using the RT tickets

- As the RT queue is set at the moment communication is difficult
 - Need to manually CC people
 - Not clear who can/should update the ticket
 - Developers cannot have an SSO account
- Ticket should be visible outside the staged rollout group and maybe world readable (i.e. to be included in documentation)

- Verification criteria and repo synchronization steps were not performed
 - The infrastructure should now be ready, we agreed with SA2 to use next NAGIOS releases as a testbed
 - Define VC for NAGIOS
 - test the repo mirroring

Emergency Release

- Emergency release definition and timeline
 - How to deal with configuration changes or changes that should be applied as soon as possible, as the “CA test” update
 - Can we use the emergency release each time?
 - Will the 1 day timeline for emergency release be respected?
 - EA redundancy
 - Is it a better option to avoid SR in those cases?

Conclusion

- JRA1 is interested in having SR for regionalised tools
- We couldn't follow the whole procedure up to now
 - but when we managed to have even an embryonic SR we got some benefits
- We can help in testing and fine tuning the procedure in the next months